



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,972	02/14/2002	Tomokazu Murakami	H-1026	4933

7590 04/03/2006

Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C.  
Suite 370  
1800 Diagonal Road  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/073,972	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MURAKAMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joshua Joo	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment filed 1/4/2006***

1. Claims 1-9 have been previously canceled.  
Claims 10-25 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 16, 18, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) As per claim 16, it is unclear if Applicant's intended meaning of "includes at least any of a broadcasting channel number over which the content was or will be broadcasted, receiving area, specified time length;" is to include one or more than one of the limitations of "broadcasting channel number over which the content was or will be broadcasted, receiving area, specified time length".

Similarly, it is unclear if Applicant's intended meaning of "includes at least any of a keyword, keyword ID number, keyword type, specified time length, time when the keyword was registered, and a number of times the keyword has been selected..." is to include one or more than one of the limitations of "a keyword, keyword ID number, keyword type, specified time length, time when the keyword was registered, and a number of times the keyword has been selected". For this Office Action, the claim will be interpreted as including only one of the limitations.

- ii) As per claim 18, Applicant claims "A method for providing information", then recites "the system comprising". Therefore, it is unclear as to whether the claim is a method or a system.

Art Unit: 2154

Furthermore, the limitation of "said information search", "information search device" in the limitation of "storing said linked information in information search device", and "the stored keyword information" all lack antecedent basis in the claim.

- iii) As per claims 21 and 22, "said second information" lacks antecedent basis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-12, 15-21, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams, US Publication #2002/0120934 (Abrahams hereinafter), in view of Arsenault et al, US Patent #6,925,650 (Arsenault hereinafter).

6. As per claims 10, 17, and 19, Abrahams teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method and system for providing information across a computer network, Abraham's teachings comprising:

an information registering device which displays an image of content rendered by a media and includes a positioning device and a sending unit, said positioning device indicating a desired object in said displayed image, and said sending device sending a first identification information containing an object information relevant to said indicated desired object, a first keyword information and a first reference information relevant to said content rendered by media to said computer network (Fig. 3-4; Paragraph 0059. Determine selectable objects. Paragraph 0047; 0049-0050. Information includes keyword, identification and reference.);

Art Unit: 2154

an information viewing device that displays an image of content rendered by said media and sends object selection information (Paragraph 0046. Viewer sees object of interest.); and

a database that links said first identification information, said first keyword information and said first reference information received from said information registering device through said computer network, and stores said linked information (Paragraph 0047-0050. Selected object is identified with identification and reference information);

wherein database performs a first matching process to match said first keyword information from said information registering device and object selection from said information viewing device; and sends at least one of said first identification information and said first reference information linked to said first keyword information according to the result of said first matching process to said computer network (Paragraph 0025. Database for storing related content. Paragraph 0049-0050; 0053; 0062. Identify and match selected object. Transmit selection information and related links to viewer.); and

said information viewing device displays said at least one of said first identification information and said first reference information from said database (Paragraph 0049-0050; 0053. Display selection information and related links.).

7. Abrahams teaches substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Abrahams does not teach of a second keyword information and matching the first and second keyword information.

8. Arsenault teaches of linking information in a digital broadcast, wherein a first keyword and a second keyword are matched, and information relating to the matching keywords are presented to the user (Col 9, line 66 – Col 10, line 14; Col 17, lines 11-31, 48-64; Col 18, line 55-Col 19, line13).

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abrahams and Arsenault because both teachings deal with linking information and providing information according to views' interests in a TV broadcast. Furthermore, the teachings of Arsenault for matching a first and second keyword and provide information relating to the matching keywords would improve the system of Abrahams by allowing users to describe and identify objects of interest through text.

10. As per claim 18, Abrahams teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for providing information across a computer network, Abraham's teaching comprising:

displaying an image of content rendered by a media (Paragraph 0046. Viewer sees object of interest.);

making inquiry a media information regarding to said displayed image of content of said media to an information search device that is connected to said computer network (Paragraph 0046. Select object of interest.);

sending an identification information containing an object information relevant to a desired object indicated from said displayed image, a first keyword information selected in said displayed keyword information and a reference information relevant to said content rendered by media through computer network (Fig. 3-4; Paragraph 0059. Determine selectable objects. Paragraph 0047; 0049-0050. Information includes keyword, identification and reference.);

linking said sent identification information, said first keyword information and said reference information in said information search device (Paragraph 0047-0050. Object is identified with keyword, identification, and reference information);

storing said linked information in information search device (Paragraph 0025. Database for storing related content.);

searching the stored keyword information corresponding to a object selection information sent from an information terminal in said information search device (Paragraphs 0047, 0049; 0053. Identify keyword information related to selected object.);

providing at least one of said identification information and said reference information linked to the searched keyword information from said information search device to said information terminal through said computer network, when said there is a keyword information corresponding to said second information (Paragraph 0049-0050; 0053. Display selection information and related links.).

11. Abrahams teaches substantial features of the claimed invention. However, Abrahams does not teach of receiving and displaying a keyword information regarding to said media information searched by said information search; and searching keyword information corresponding to a second keyword information.

12. Arsenault teaches of linking information in a digital broadcast, wherein keyword information is displayed (Col 11, line 64 – Col 12, line 11; Col 16, lines 55-65; Col 17, lines 11-31); a first keyword and a second keyword are matched; and information relating to the matching keywords are presented to the viewer (Col 9, line 66 – Col 10, line 14; Col 17, lines 11-31, 48-64; Col 18, line 55-Col 19, line13).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abrahams and Arsenault because both teachings deal with linking information and providing information according to views' interests in a TV broadcast. Furthermore, the teachings of Arsenault to perform the method of Paragraph 12 would improve the system of Abrahams by providing users with predefined keywords for identifying and

Art Unit: 2154

searching contents of interest, which would improve the user-friendliness of Abrahams' system, and by allowing users to identify content of interest through text.

14. As per claims 11 and 20, Abrahams does not teach the system for providing information as recited in claim 10, wherein said database sends a stored keyword list prior to receiving said second keyword information from said information viewing device in response to inquiry made from said information viewing device.

15. Arsenault teaches of sending a stored keyword list prior to receiving a second keyword from the viewer in response to inquiry made from the viewer (Col 11, line 64 – Col 12, line 11; Col 16, lines 55-65; Col 17, lines 11-31).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abrahams and Arsenault because the teachings of Arsenault to send a stored keyword list prior to receiving a second keyword from the viewer in response to inquiry made from the viewer would improve the system of Abrahams by providing users with predefined keywords for identifying and searching objects, which would improve the user-friendliness of Abrahams and Arsenault's system.

17. As per claims 12 and 21, Abrahams teaches the system for providing information as recited in claim 10, wherein said database further receives second identification information from said information viewing device (Paragraph 0046-0047. Object selection.), and said database further performs a second matching process to match said first identification information from said information registering device and said second identification information from said information viewing, and sends said first reference information linked to said first



Art Unit: 2154

identification information and said first keyword information according to a result of said second matching process to said information viewing device through said computer network (Fig. 3-4; Paragraph 0049-0050. Provides URL links and keyword, e.g Sony Walkman.).

18. As per claims 15 and 24, Abrahams teaches the system for providing information as recited in claim 10, wherein said database comprises:

a keyword table which has at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry and a keyword field to contain the first keyword, wherein one record entry includes at least its ID and a keyword (Figs. 3-4; Paragraph 0049-0050; 0053. Keyword corresponds to program selection information and related links.);

a reference information table which has at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry, a reference information field containing the first reference information, and a keyword ID field to containing the keyword ID associated with the reference information, wherein one record entry includes at least its ID, reference information, and the associated keyword ID (Paragraph 0049-0050; 0053. Links correspond to keyword objects.);

a target image object table which has at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry, a time and frame field containing information to identify media information, and an link ID field containing the ID of reference information linked with the object, wherein one record entry includes at least its ID, media information, and the ID of reference information linked with the object (Paragraph 0047; 0050; 0053. Selection information comprises time and frame information. Identification information is linked with related links.).

19. As per claims 16 and 25, Abrahams teaches the system for providing information as recited in claim 10, wherein: said content rendered by media is video image information

Art Unit: 2154

distributed by TV broadcasting (Paragraph 0025; 0057. TV broadcast.); said first keyword information includes at least any of a keyword, keyword ID number, keyword type, specified time length, time when the keyword was registered, and a number of times the keyword has been selected as user preference (Fig. 3-4; Paragraph 0049. Keyword.); and said reference information includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) that designates a Web site/page on the Internet (Paragraphs 0050; 0053. URL.). However, Abrahams does not teach said first identification information further includes at least any of a broadcasting channel over which the content was or will be broadcasted, receiving area, specified time length.

20. Arsenault teaches of identification information comprising of broadcasting channel and time length (Col 8, lines 18-34; Col 15, lines 35-58).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abrahams and Arsenault because the teachings of Arsenault for identification information to comprise of broadcasting channel and time length would improve the system of Abrahams and Arsenault by providing additional information that are related to content of interest, which may help viewers to identify objects in the content.

22. Claims 13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams and Arsenault, in view of Wu et al, US Patent #6,326,982 (Wu hereinafter).

23. As per claims 13 and 22, Abraham teaches of sending said first reference information linked to said first identification information and said first keyword information according to a result of said third matching process to said information viewing device through said computer network (Fig. 3-4; Paragraphs 0049-0050.). Abrahams does not teach wherein said database further receives second reference information from said information viewing device; said

Art Unit: 2154

database further performs a third matching process to match URLs or comments respectively included in the first and second reference information

24. Wu teaches the concept of matching URLs associated with television programming and providing information related to the URLs (Abstract; Col 2, lines 52-65; Col 7, lines 21-40).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abrahams, Arsenault, and Wu because the teachings of the teachings of Wu to match URLs and providing information related to URLs would improve the system of Abrahams and Arsenault by providing alternative methods for viewers to identify and receive information regarding objects of interest, and in this case, accessing predetermined web pages through URL matching.

26. Claims 14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrahams and Arsenault, in view of Rekimoto, US Patent #6,636,249 (Rekimoto hereinafter).

27. As per claims 14 and 23, Abrahams and Arsenault taught the system for providing information as recited in claim 10, wherein said first matching process in said database has a process for determining: whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicates (Arsenault: Col 9, line 66 – Col 10, line 14; Col 17, lines 11-31, 48-64; Col 18, line 55-Col 19, line13). However, Abrahams and Arsenault do not teach whether time length associated with the first keyword information and time length associated with the second keyword information match or are duplicates in addition to determining whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicates; or whether a time when the first keyword information was registered falls within a time length associated

Art Unit: 2154

with the second keyword information in addition to determining whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicates.

28. Rekimoto teaches the concept of searching and matching keywords based on time length from the first and second keyword information (Col 20, line 66 – Col 21, line 11).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rekimoto into the system of Abraham's and Arsenault because the teachings of Rekimoto to provide matching keywords based on the keyword and time length would improve the keyword matching of Abraham and Arseanult's system by providing additional matching criteria, which would provide results that are more accurate and specific to viewers' requests.

### ***Conclusion***

30. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- i) Rosin et al, US Publication #2002/0078467, discloses an Internet on-demand system for television programs, and linking objects with information.
- ii) Papagan et al, US Publication #2002/0059604, discloses a system for linking media content for interactive broadcasts.

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2154


32. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

35. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 20, 2006  
JJ

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100